

Chaotic Evolution in Quantum Mechanics

Asher Peres*

Department of Physics, Technion—Israel Institute of Technology, 32 000 Haifa, Israel

(10 August 1995)

Abstract

A quantum system is described, whose wave function has a complexity which increases exponentially with time. Namely, for any fixed orthonormal basis, the number of components required for an accurate representation of the wave function increases exponentially.

PACS: 05.45.+b

* Electronic address: peres@photon.technion.ac.il

This Letter describes a quantum system whose representation becomes increasingly complex with the passage of time. This behavior, which is well known as a generic property of *classical* Hamiltonian systems, is commonly called “chaos.” For example, an initially smooth Liouville density becomes more and more convoluted as time passes, and it may form intricate shapes with exceedingly thin and long protuberances. However, quantum wave functions usually have a milder behavior [1]. In particular, quantum systems with discrete spectra can be represented, with arbitrary accuracy, by a *finite* number of eigenfunctions which are periodic in time. Their wave function thus is almost periodic. Its *computational complexity* [2, 3] does not increase as time passes. (Some authors use other criteria for complexity, such as the visual appearance of wave functions, but these seem rather subjective.)

In this Letter, I describe a quantum system whose wave function becomes increasingly complex with time, just as a Liouville density would do in classical mechanics. The long range evolution of the wave function is effectively unpredictable with finite computing resources. This is a genuine example of *quantum chaos*. I have no pretense that the abstract model discussed here represents, even approximately, a real physical object. However, this is a formal proof that, contrary to some claims, quantum mechanics is compatible with the existence of chaos.

Such a chaotic quantum system can be constructed for any classical area-preserving map. As a concrete example, I shall choose a map consisting of alternating twists and turns of a unit sphere. That map has a quantum version, called “kicked top” [4], with a discrete, finite-dimensional quasi-energy spectrum. Therefore, unlike the classical map, the quantum kicked top is not truly chaotic. However, a classical dynamical system may have several, different quantum versions. Another quantization of the same twist and turn (T&T) map is presented here, which is just as chaotic as the original classical map.

The latter is defined as follows: consider the unit sphere, $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 1$. Each step of the T&T map consists of a twist by an angle a around the z -axis (namely, every xy plane turns by an angle az), followed by a 90° rigid rotation around the y -axis. The result is

$$\begin{aligned}x' &= z, \\y' &= x \sin(az) + y \cos(az), \\z' &= -x \cos(az) + y \sin(az).\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

This map is obviously area preserving. For low values of a , most classical orbits are regular (that is, they are quasi-periodic). As a increases, so does the fraction of chaotic

orbits, until for $a = 3$ most of the sphere is visited by a single chaotic orbit (all numerical calculations below refer to the case $a = 3$).

The “kicked top” [4] is a mechanical system (classical or quantal) which mimics the above geometrical map. In the classical case, the top has a 3-dimensional generalized phase space [5], with canonical variables J_x , J_y , and J_z , satisfying Poisson brackets $\{J_x, J_y\} = J_z$, and cyclic permutations. The mapping

$$\begin{aligned} J'_x &= J_z, \\ J'_y &= J_x \sin(aJ_z/J) + J_y \cos(aJ_z/J), \\ J'_z &= -J_x \cos(aJ_z/J) + J_y \sin(aJ_z/J), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

is a canonical transformation [6] which leaves J^2 invariant. The classical values of J_x/J , J_y/J , and J_z/J , lie on a unit sphere, and therefore they transform just as x , y and z in Eq. (1).

A natural way of quantizing these equations is to replace the classical variables J_k by the corresponding quantum operators. Equation (2) then becomes a quantum map, generated by the *unitary* transformation

$$U = \exp(-i\pi J_y/2\hbar) \exp(-iaJ_z^2/2J\hbar). \tag{3}$$

For any eigenstate of J , this U is a matrix of order $(2j + 1)$, with a discrete spectrum. The evolution is multiply periodic, and there is no chaos analogous to that of the classical map: computing the wave function for long times is not more difficult than for short times. (There still is hypersensitivity to small perturbations [7], but this is not “chaos” in the classical sense.)

We can also consider quantum systems which are not restricted to a particular value of j . Their Hilbert space is spanned by the spherical harmonics $Y_j^m(\theta, \phi)$, with angles θ and ϕ related to the cartesian coordinates in Eq. (1) in the usual way: $x = \sin \theta \cos \phi$, etc. The unitary evolution is still generated by Eq. (3), where it is now understood that the various J_k have to be written as block-diagonal matrices, with blocks of order $(2j + 1)$. In that case, it is also possible to write the wave function as

$$\psi(\theta, \phi) = \sum_{jm} C_{jm} Y_j^m(\theta, \phi), \tag{4}$$

but its components with different j are never mixed by the U matrix. They evolve independently of each other. There still is no chaos: the cost of computing the final state does not increase with the number of steps. We thus see that the quantum kicked

top is not a faithful replica of the classical T&T map. The reason for this failure of the correspondence principle is explained below, and an alternative quantization method will be proposed.

Consider the Hamiltonian which generates the unitary map (3):

$$H = aJ_z^2/2J + (\pi J_y/2) \sum_n \delta(t - n), \quad (5)$$

where the unit of time is the duration of one step. In this Hamiltonian, the twist is continuous, and the rotation proceeds by kicks (the opposite choice is also possible). If ψ is represented by a set of C_{jm} coefficients as in Eq. (4), the J_k in (5) are block-diagonal, as explained above. On the other hand we may as well use the “coordinate basis” and directly write $\psi(\theta, \phi)$ without expanding into spherical harmonics, which is closer to the spirit of the classical T&T map. We then have $J_z = -i\hbar \partial/\partial\phi$, and more complicated differential operators for J_x and J_y [8]. In particular,

$$J = -i\hbar \left[\frac{1}{\sin\theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} \left(\sin\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} \right) + \frac{1}{\sin^2\theta} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\phi^2} \right]^{1/2}. \quad (6)$$

When we were in a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, it was natural (indeed unavoidable) to write the twist generator as $J_z^2/2J$. However, for arbitrary $\psi(\theta, \phi)$, a more natural expression for the twist generator is $J_z \cos\theta$. Let us therefore replace (5) by

$$H = aJ_z \cos\theta + (\pi J_y/2) \sum_n \delta(t - n). \quad (7)$$

This is a Hermitian operator which does not commute with J^2 , so that J^2 is not conserved. (In other words, $J_z \cos\theta$ has nonvanishing matrix elements between Y_j^m with different j , and cannot be written solely in terms of the J_k matrices.) Instead of (3) we now have

$$U = \exp(-i\pi J_y/2\hbar) \exp(-iaJ_z \cos\theta/\hbar). \quad (8)$$

The crucial difference is that the spectra of the new H and U include *continuous* parts, and therefore permit the existence of true chaos. This can be shown as follows. Returning to the classical T&T map (1), let us consider, instead of individual points, a mass density $\rho(\theta, \phi)$ spread on the unit sphere. We may even consider *complex* densities, if we wish. Let us further assume that the infinitesimal mass, $\rho(\theta, \phi)d\Omega$, attached to the area element $d\Omega = \sin\theta d\theta d\phi$, is conserved by the T&T map. It thus behaves as an incompressible fluid, or as a Liouville density would do while moving in phase space.

As the map is area preserving, namely $d\Omega' = d\Omega$, we have, at each step,

$$\rho'(\theta, \phi) = \rho(\theta, \phi). \quad (9)$$

This implies that the map is *unitary*: for any two densities ρ_1 and ρ_2 ,

$$\int \rho'_1(\theta, \phi)^* \rho'_2(\theta, \phi) d\Omega' = \int \rho_1(\theta, \phi)^* \rho_2(\theta, \phi) d\Omega. \quad (10)$$

Such a unitarity property was proved long ago by Koopman [9] for Liouville densities in phase space. There is a large body of knowledge on the ergodicity and mixing properties of Liouville functions [10]: In the generic non-integrable case, the Liouvillian has a *continuous* spectrum, in which an infinite number of discrete lines may be embedded. If the dynamical system has a finite measure, the unitary operator U has at least one eigenvalue equal to 1, corresponding to equilibrium. Moreover, it can be proved [10] that, if the system is ergodic, but not mixing, that eigenvalue is nondegenerate, and all the other eigenvalues of U form a subgroup of the circle group. On the other hand, for a mixing system, which also has a single nondegenerate eigenvalue 1, the rest of the spectrum is absolutely continuous. A generic dynamical system may have some regions of phase space which are subject to mixing, others which are only ergodic, and still others which are not even ergodic. Such a system is called “decomposable” [11]. In that case, the spectrum of U is continuous, with an infinite number of discrete lines embedded in it. In particular, the eigenvalue 1, and possibly others, are degenerate.

Now, it is easily seen that the quantum wave function $\psi(\theta, \phi)$ behaves, under the unitary transformation U in Eq. (8), exactly as the fictitious incompressible mass density described above. This is obvious for the rotation operator, $\exp(-i\pi J_y/2\hbar)$, which performs a rigid rotation of ψ around the y -axis. For the twist, $\exp(-iaJ_z \cos \theta/\hbar)$, we have

$$\psi(\theta, \phi) \rightarrow \psi'(\theta, \phi) = \psi(\theta, \phi - a \cos \theta). \quad (11)$$

That is, the wave function ψ moves on the surface of the unit sphere exactly as the classical points did, and it remains normalized, by virtue of the unitarity of the mapping. The essential difference between this new quantum system and the former kicked top is that the new Hamiltonian (which formally behaves as a classical Liouville operator) has a partly continuous spectrum. Therefore the evolution of $\psi(\theta, \phi)$ cannot be represented, even approximately, by a finite number of terms.

Let us examine this evolution more closely. The rotational part of U is represented, in the Y_j^m basis, by the familiar orthogonal matrix $U_{mm'}^{(j)}$, namely a block-diagonal matrix

with blocks of size $(2j + 1)$ [12, 13]. In the same basis, the twist (11) is also represented by a unitary transformation [14],

$$C_{jm} \rightarrow C'_{jm} = \sum_l U_{jl}^{(m)} C_{lm}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$U_{jl}^{(m)} = \int Y_j^{m*}(\theta, \phi) Y_l^m(\theta, \phi) e^{-ima \cos \theta} d\Omega, \quad (13)$$

is a band matrix. This transformation leaves m invariant, but introduces all the j with $j > |m|$ (with exponentially small coefficients for large j).

It is now possible to give a quantitative measure for the complexity of the wave function. Its information entropy [15],

$$S = - \sum_{jm} |C_{jm}|^2 \log |C_{jm}|^2, \quad (14)$$

has the intuitive meaning that e^S roughly indicates the number of basis vectors that are appreciably involved in the expansion of ψ into spherical harmonics. This “entropy” of course depends of the choice of the basis (namely, spherical harmonics). However, it can be shown [14] that when S becomes large, its value is asymptotically independent of the choice of the basis, provided that the transformation between different bases is given by a band matrix (the latter property holds for any two bases whose definition is not algorithmically complex).

Finally, let us illustrate the above considerations by a numerical example. A plot of S versus the number of steps is shown in Fig. 1, for $a = 3$ and for two initial states, $\psi_{\pm}$, with

$$C_{11} = \pm C_{1,-1} = 1/\sqrt{2}, \quad (15)$$

respectively, and all other $C_{lm} = 0$. It is seen that S increases roughly linearly (with a small negative second derivative), so that, as the wave function evolves and becomes more and more complicated, the effective number of components needed for representing it increases about exponentially with time. (The calculation of the last step in Fig. 1 involved all the matrices with j, l, m , up to 500. The next step would have exceeded the capacity of my workstation, or entailed a severe loss of accuracy.)

Some of the ideas presented here originated during a visit to the International Center of Theoretical Physics, Trieste, whose hospitality is gratefully acknowledged. I had interesting discussions with Felix Izrailev and Dima Shepelyansky. This work was supported by the Gerard Swope Fund, and the Fund for Encouragement of Research.

1. H. J. Korsch and M. V. Berry, *Physica D* **3**, 627 (1981).
2. C. H. Bennett, “Dissipation, Information, Computational Complexity and the Definition of Organization” in *Emerging Syntheses in Science*, ed. by D. Pines (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1987) pp. 215–231.
3. G. Brassard and P. Bratley, *Fundamentals of Algorithmics* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1995) Chapt. 12.
4. F. Haake, M. Kuś, and R. Scharf, *Zeits. Phys. B* **65**, 381 (1987).
5. J. L. Martin, *Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A* **251**, 536 (1959).
6. A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1993) p. 300.
7. A. Peres, “Instability of Quantum Motion of a Chaotic System” in *Quantum Chaos: Proceedings of the Adriatic Research Conference on Quantum Chaos*, ed. by H. A. Cerdeira, R. Ramaswamy, M. C. Gutzwiller, and G. Casati (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991) pp. 73–102.
8. L. I. Schiff, *Quantum Mechanics* (McGraw Hill, New York, 1968) p. 82.
9. B. O. Koopman, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **17**, 315 (1931).
10. P. R. Halmos, *Lectures on Ergodic Theory* (Chelsea, New York, 1956) pp. 34–46.
11. V. I. Arnold and A. Avez, *Ergodic Problems of Classical Mechanics* (Benjamin, New York, 1968) p. 17.
12. E. P. Wigner, *Group Theory and Its Application to the Quantum Mechanics of Atomic Spectra* (Academic Press, New York, 1959) p. 167.
13. M. Tinkham, *Group Theory and Quantum Mechanics* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1964) p. 110.
14. A. Peres and D. Terno, “Evolution of Liouville Density of a Chaotic System” (submitted to *Phys. Rev. E*).
15. F. M. Izrailev, *Phys. Lett. A* **134**, 13 (1988); *J. Phys. A* **22**, 865 (1989).
16. J. Ford, “Chaos: Solving the Unsolvable, Predicting the Unpredictable!” in *Chaotic Dynamics and Fractals* ed. by M. F. Barnsley and S. G. Demko (Academic Press, New York, 1986) pp. 1–52.

Caption of figure

FIG. 1. Growth of S for the two initial states in Eq. (15).